DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 422 IR 007 586

AUTHOR	Shields, Joyce Lee
TITLE	An Empirical Investigation of the Effect of Heteroscedasticity and Heterogeneity of Variance on the Analysis of Covariance and the Johnson-Neyman Technique.
INSTITUTION	Army Research Inst. for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (Army), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ARI-TP-292
PUB DATE	Jul 78
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Analysis of Covariance; *Comparative Analysis; Doctoral Theses; Goodness of Fit; *Mathematical Models; Simulation; *Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	Homogeneity of Variance; Homoscedasticity of Variance; *Johnson Neyman Technique

ABSTRACT

The robustness of the Johnson-Neyman technique and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance was tested through the use of Monte Carlo computer procedures. The study simulated a one-way, fixed-effects analysis with two treatment groups, one criterion, Y, and one covariate, X. Five fixed values of the covariate were selected with zero mean and unit variance, while the values of Y were varied randomly with a constant regression coefficient of .75. Four combinations of group sizes, five combinations of group variances, and five forms of heteroscedasticity were studied. Results indicated that ANCOVA is robust to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance, both singly and in combination, when group sizes were equal; For cases of different group sizes and heterogeneous variances, a predictable bias was observed. The Johnson-Neyman technique was sensitive to violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity for both equal and unequal group sizes. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175422

Technical Paper 292

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF HETEROSCEDASTICITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF VARIANCE ON THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND THE JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Joyce Lee Shields

Submitted by:

Milton S. Katz, Chief
INDIVIDUAL TRAINING & SKILL EVALUATION TECHNICAL AREA

Technical accuracy and completeness certified by:

Milton S. Katz,
Technical Area Chief

Approved by:

E. Ralph Dusek, Director
INDIVIDUAL TRAINING & PERFORMANCE RESEARCH LABORATORY

Joseph Zeidner
TECHNICAL DIRECTOR (DESIGNATE)

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

July 1978

Army Project Number
2Q762722A777

Individual Training Technology

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

IR007582

ARI Research Reports and Technical Papers are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the latter part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Technical Paper 292	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF HETEROSCEDASTICITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF VARIANCE ON THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND THE JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Technical Paper 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
7. AUTHOR(s) Joyce Lee Shields		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q762722A777
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Washington, DC 20310		12. REPORT DATE July 1978 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 34
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) --		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

--

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

This publication is based upon a dissertation submitted by Joyce L. Shields in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Ph.D.

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA)	Psychological Statistics
Johnson-Neyman Technique	Statistical Models
Monte Carlo Program	Regression Analysis

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

The robustness of the Johnson-Neyman technique and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance was tested through the use of Monte Carlo computer procedures. The study simulated a one-way, fixed-effects analysis with two treatment groups, one criterion, and one covariate. Five fixed values of the covariate were selected with zero mean and unit variance, while the values of Y were varied randomly with a constant regression coefficient of .75. Four combinations

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. ABSTRACT (Continued)

of group sizes (10,10;10,20;20,10;20,20), five combinations of group variances (1,1;1,2;2,1;1,5;5,1), and five forms of heteroscedasticity (combined in 18 different pairs), were studied. These conditions were combined to produce 186 different simulated experimental conditions. For each simulated condition 3000 pseudo-random samples were generated and sampling distributions relevant to the Johnson-Neyman technique and ANCOVA were compiled.

Results indicated that ANCOVA is robust to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance, both singly and in combination, when group sizes were equal. For cases of different group sizes and heterogeneous variances a predictable bias was observed. When the larger variance was combined with the smaller group size the bias was conservative. When the pairings were reversed the bias was nonconservative. The Johnson-Neyman technique was sensitive to violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity for both equal and unequal group sizes. The effect of heteroscedasticity was to order the probability that any fixed value of X would be included in a region of significance in a sequence parallel to the form of heteroscedasticity. That is, in general, as the variance for a fixed value of X increased, the probability of including that value of the covariate in a region of significance increased.

FOREWORD

In the course of conducting research, the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) makes use of many statistical models and techniques suited to a wide variety of information gathering and hypothesis testing. The nature of conditions in the field, where the best Army data can be collected, often results in violations of assumptions assumed to be critical for the validity of specific statistical operations or models. The information provided in this Technical Paper is useful, not only in the Individual Training and Skill Evaluation Technical Area but to experimenters and analysts in other areas of behavior science research who need to determine the appropriateness of using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) or the Johnson-Neyman technique.

The entire research is responsive to requirements of RDT&E Project PE62722A777, Individual Training Technology, FY 1978 Work Program, and to special requirements of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

Joseph Zeidner
Technical Director (Designate)

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF HETEROSCEDASTICITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF VARIANCE ON THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND THE JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE.

BRIEF

Requirement:

To determine the effects of violating the assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance on significance tests associated with ANCOVA and the Johnson-Neyman technique.

Procedure:

The robustness of the Johnson-Neyman technique and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance was tested through use of Monte Carlo computer procedures. The study simulated a one-way, fixed-effects analysis with two treatment groups, one criterion, Y, and one covariate, X. Five fixed values of the covariate were selected with zero mean and unit variance, while the values of Y were varied randomly with a constant regression coefficient of .75. Four combinations of group sizes (10,10;10,20;20,10;20,20), five combinations of group variances (1,1;1,2;2,1;1,5;5,1), and five forms of heteroscedasticity (combined in 18 different pairs), were studied. These conditions were combined to produce 186 different simulated experimental conditions. For each simulated condition, 3000 pseudo-random samples were generated and sampling distributions relevant to the Johnson-Neyman technique and ANCOVA were compiled.

Findings:

Results indicated that ANCOVA is robust to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance, both singly and in combination, when group sizes were equal. For cases of different group sizes and heterogeneous variances a predictable bias was observed. When the larger variance was combined with the larger group size the bias was conservative. When the pairings were reversed the bias was non-conservative. The Johnson-Neyman technique was sensitive to violation of the assumption homoscedasticity for both equal and unequal group sizes. The effect of heteroscedasticity was to order the probability that any fixed value of X would be included in a region of significance in a sequence parallel to the form of heteroscedasticity. That is, in general, as the variance for a fixed value of X increased, the probability of including that value of the covariate in a region of significance increased. As observed with ANCOVA, the Johnson-Neyman technique was robust to heterogeneity of variance when group sizes were equal. However, when group sizes were

not equal the empirical probabilities were biased in a non-conservative direction when the larger variance was combined with the smaller group size, and in a conservative direction when the larger variance and larger group size were combined.

Utilization of Findings:

In many empirical situations such as practical field experiments conducted within the Army it is not possible to meet all the assumptions of statistical models. If one or more of the assumptions is violated, the user has the choice of abandoning the model or proceeding with the analysis at some risk. The results of this study may be used by the investigator to estimate the degree of bias in the test of significance associated with either ANCOVA or the Johnson-Neyman technique.

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF HETEROSCEDASTICITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF VARIANCE ON THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND THE JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE

CONTENTS

	Page
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	3
PROCEDURE	7
Heterogeneity of Variance	7
Heteroscedasticity	8
The Simulation Procedure	11
Goodness-of-fit Procedure	11
RESULTS	12
The Analysis of Covariance	12
The Johnson-Neyman Technique	12
DISCUSSION	26
SUMMARY	28
REFERENCES	30

TABLES

Table 1.	Comparison of Actual and Nominal Levels of Significance in Simulations of "True" Experiments Obtained by Peckham (1968), Hamilton (1972), and McClaren (1972)	6
2.	Values of σ_y^2 and ρ where $\sigma_{y\|x}^2=\sigma_y^2(1-\rho^2)$ and $\sigma_x^2=1$, =.75	7
3.	Values for $\sigma_{y\|x_i}^2$ where $\sigma_{y\|x}^2=1,2$, or 5, for the Five Forms of Heteroscedasticity for the Five Fixed Values of the Concomitant Variable, X	9
4.	Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness-of-fit Tests of the Empirical to the Theoretical F Distribution for Each of the Simulated Experimental Conditions	13

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF HETEROSCEDASTICITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF VARIANCE ON THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND THE JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE

CONTENTS

Page

TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table 5. Empirical Alpha Levels Corresponding to Nominal Alpha Levels of .10, .05, .02, and .01 for Each Simulated Experimental Condition 14

6. Empirical Probability of Inclusion of Each Fixed X in a Region of Significance at Nominal Alpha Levels of .10, .05, .025, and .01 for Each Experimental Condition 17

7. Empirical Probability of Obtaining a Johnson-Neyman Region of Significance at Nominal Alpha Equal to .10, .05, .025, and .01 for Each Simulated Experimental Condition 23

8. Empirical Results Obtained Using Potthoff's Simultaneous Confidence Bounds When All Assumptions Are Met and Group Size Equals 10 28

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF HETEROSCEDASTICITY AND HETEROGENEITY OF VARIANCE ON THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE AND THE JOHNSON-NEYMAN TECHNIQUE

The effect on Type I error rates and power of violations of assumptions of mathematical models underlying statistical analyses has been studied for some time. Although many of the theoretical consequences have been derived, it was only with the advent of high speed computers that the empirical consequences could be determined with facility. As pointed out in a recent review by Glass et al. (1972), "the assumptions of most mathematical models are always false to a greater or lesser degree." The purpose of this study was to compare the empirical results of certain reasonable violations of two of the assumptions underlying the mathematical models associated with the analysis of covariance (Fisher, 1932) and the Johnson-Neyman technique (Johnson and Neyman, 1936).

Although both the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and the Johnson-Neyman technique incorporate regression methods in order to increase the precision of an experimental design, ANCOVA assumes homogeneity of regression whereas the Johnson-Neyman technique is not based on this assumption. Furthermore, there are two current areas of great interest in educational psychology research where heterogeneity of regression might be expected (e.g., Aptitude Treatment Interaction (Bracht, 1970) and Moderator Variables (Bartlett et al., 1969; Ghiselli, 1963)). Therefore, the Johnson-Neyman technique becomes an important alternative to ANCOVA.

The Johnson-Neyman technique defines a region along the covariate where significant treatment differences exist between two groups. Unlike ANCOVA, the Johnson-Neyman technique does not test a hypothesis, but yields a confidence interval. The region not included in the confidence interval, or the region of significance, may be a single continuous region or two distinct regions where one group is significantly better on the criterion in one region, and significantly inferior in the other region.

The mathematical model for both ANCOVA and the Johnson-Neyman technique is:

$$Y_{kj} = \alpha_j + \beta_j X_{kj} + e_{kj}$$

where

α_j = Y intercept of the Y-on-X regression line for group j.

β_j = regression slope of the Y-on-X regression line for group j.

e_{kj} = error of estimate for score k in group j.

The e_{kj} are assumed to be independently and normally distributed with 0 mean and homogeneous variance, $\sigma^2 = \sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$. That is, it is assumed that errors of estimate are homogeneous for each fixed value of the concomitant variable, X_j, both within a treatment group (homoscedasticity), and between treatment groups (homogeneity of variance).

In addition to the assumption of constant error variance, both models assume: a linear relationship between the criterion and concomitant variable and that values of the concomitant variable are fixed and measured without error. ANCOVA makes the additional assumption of homogeneity of regression, i.e., $\beta_j = \beta_w$ for all groups.

In many empirical situations it is not possible to meet all the assumptions of statistical models. If one or more of the assumptions is violated, the user has the choice of abandoning the model or proceeding with the analysis at some risk. Theoretical discussions of a technique often enable the investigator to determine whether his test is biased in a conservative or liberal direction, while empirical investigations of violations often enable the investigator to estimate the degree of bias.

The purpose of this study was to compare, by Monte Carlo methods, the effects of violating assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance on significance tests associated with ANCOVA and the Johnson-Neyman technique. The research questions asked are:

1. Are the Johnson-Neyman technique and ANCOVA robust to the violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity?

2. Are the Johnson-Neyman technique and ANCOVA robust to the violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance?

3. Are the Johnson-Neyman technique and ANCOVA robust to the simultaneous violation of the assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

ANCOVA is an extension of analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression analysis. As such, assumptions underlying ANCOVA include all those associated with ANOVA and regression analysis as well as the assumption of homogeneity of regression. Therefore, results from studies of the robustness of ANOVA to violations of some of its assumptions might be expected to extend to ANCOVA. Particularly pertinent to the current study is research on violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance. The effect of heterogeneous variances on Type I error rates has been investigated theoretically (Box, 1954; Scheffé, 1959) and empirically (Norton, as reported in Lindquist, 1953).

Scheffé (1959) reports the work of Hsu who calculated the exact probability of Type I error rates for a two-tailed t test at the .05 level for three different pairs of sample sizes (15,5;5,3 and 7,7) and 9 ratios of population variances σ_1^2/σ_2^2 (0,.1,.2,.5,1,2,5,10,∞). Scheffé (1959) extended Hsu's data to large samples in the two-group case and studied 4 ratios of sample sizes (1,2,5,∞) and 7 ratios of population variances, σ_1^2/σ_2^2 (0,.2,.5,1,2,5,∞).

Scheffé concluded that inequality of variances has little effect on Type I error rate when sample sizes are equal, but has serious effects when sample sizes are not equal. In general, when the larger variance is associated with the smaller sample size the true probability of Type I error was found to exceed the nominal value, and when the larger variance and sample size were paired the Type I error rate was found to be less than the nominal value.

Box (1954) calculated exact probabilities of Type I errors for fixed-effect ANOVA F tests at a nominal 5 percent level. The results were obtained for 3, 5, and 7 groups, variance ratios of 1:2:3; 1:1:3; 1:1:1:1:3; and 1:1:1:1:1:1:7, and for 11 combinations of equal and unequal group sizes. In general, it was observed that the F test is robust to the violation of homogeneity of variance for equal sample sizes, but not for unequal sample sizes. When the largest variance was associated with the smallest sample size, the actual Type I error rate was greater than the nominal value; when the largest variance was associated with the largest sample size, the value of α was smaller than nominal.

The robustness of the F test to heterogeneous variances in balanced designs reported by Scheffé (1959) and Box (1954) was consistent with an empirical investigation by Norton (as reported in Lindquist, 1953). Using a Monte Carlo simulation technique, he constructed (by hand) populations of 10,000 cases each and sampled from these populations in order to create empirical sampling distributions. In the phase of his study in which he investigated heterogeneity of variance, populations were normal with equal means, but different variances

(σ^2_x = 25, 100, and 225). Marked heterogeneity of variance (1:4:9) resulted in a small but predictable bias in the Type I errors and empirical values were generally greater than nominal values.

Little research on the effect of heterogeneity of variance on robustness of ANCOVA has been conducted. A theoretical paper by Potthoff (1965) showed that the sensitivity of ANCOVA to heterogeneous variances depended on the ratio $n_1\sigma_{x_1}/n_2\sigma_{x_2}$ where n is sample size and σ_x is the standard error of the covariate. Three empirical studies have been conducted concerning effects of violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance while simultaneously violating the assumption of homogeneity of regression (Peckham, 1968; Hamilton, 1972; and McClaren, 1972). In all studies, variance of the criterion measure (σ^2_y) and variance of the covariate (σ^2_x) were held constant while varying population regression slopes (β), thereby producing a concomitant change in $\sigma^2_{y|x}$ (where $\sigma^2_{y|x} = \sigma^2_y - \sigma^2_x\beta^2$). In the model for ANCOVA the assumption of homogeneity of variance applies to the variance error of estimate ($\sigma^2_{y|x}$).

Peckham (1968) varied regression slopes (and $\sigma^2_{y|x}$), number of groups and sample size, although sample size was equal between groups for all of his comparisons. Values of the covariate were fixed and were chosen to conform as closely as possible to a normal distribution. Peckham found that there were very small discrepancies in the actual and empirical significance levels. In general, he observed that as the degree of heterogeneity of the regression slopes (and heterogeneity of variance) increased, the empirical rate of Type I errors was less than the nominal value.

In McClaren's (1972) study, the number of treatment groups were 2, 3, and 5, and the sample sizes were 20, 30, 40, 100, or 200, and regression slopes were .1,.2,.3,.4,.5,.6,.7,.8, and .9. The average slope across treatments was held constant at .5 for 180 out of the 183 simulated conditions. The values of the concomitant variable were fixed, with zero mean and unit variance. For equal group sizes, he found that as degree of heterogeneity of regression increased (and heterogeneity of variance increased), the empirical level of significance became more conservative. For unequal sample sizes, the results parallel the effect of violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance reported by Box (1954) and Scheffé (1959). That is, when the smallest regression coefficient and the largest variance were combined with the smallest sample size, the empirical significance levels were biased in a non-conservative direction and when the pairings were reversed the test was conservative.

Hamilton (1972) restricted the number of groups to two and varied sizes, with distributions of the criterion and the covariate being bivariate normal. Hamilton's results, in general, parallel the results of the effect of violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance

reported by Box (1954) and Scheffé (1959). Hamilton found ANCOVA robust to the violation of homogeneity of regression (and variance) for equal sample sizes, but observed large discrepancies in empirical and nominal alpha levels for unequal sample sizes. When the larger sample size occurred with the larger regression slope, and therefore smaller $\sigma^2_{y|x}$, the empirical alpha levels were greater than corresponding nominal alpha levels. When the smaller group size was paired with the larger regression slope (and smaller $\sigma^2_{y|x}$), he observed that empirical alpha levels were less than corresponding nominal levels. Hamilton's study appears to present evidence for the generalizability of results from the study of the effect of violating the assumptions associated with ANOVA, as suggested by Cochran (1957) and Winer (1971).

In one condition, Hamilton studied the same combination of equal sample sizes, number of groups, and regression coefficients as Peckham and as McClaren, but failed to replicate their results; a comparison is presented in Table 1. Whereas Hamilton's values were close to nominal alpha, Peckham and McClaren observed a conservative bias in empirical alpha levels where group sizes were equal and regression slopes heterogeneous. It is difficult to resolve the discrepancies in the results of these studies. Although it is impossible to determine simple effects of violating the assumption of homogeneity of regression or variance from the results of Hamilton (1972), McClaren (1972), and Peckham (1968), an analytical study by Atiquallah (1964) suggests that the F test of ANCOVA is robust to the violation of the assumption of homogeneity of regression when sample size is large and the means of the concomitant variable are equal; otherwise, the test is biased in a conservative direction.

There is no study examining the unique effect of heteroscedasticity on the robustness of ANCOVA. For an overview of ANCOVA and the effects of other violations on ANOVA and ANCOVA, comprehensive reviews by Glass et al. (1971) and Elashoff (1969) are available.

The Johnson-Neyman technique has not received as much attention as ANCOVA and little is known concerning the effects of violating assumptions underlying this statistical method. As originally presented, the Johnson-Neyman technique was designed for the case of two predictor variables, two treatment groups, and one criterion (Johnson and Neyman, 1936), and papers on the technique have concerned extension to cases of "n" predictor variables and "k" groups (Abelson, 1953; Potthoff, 1964).

Table 1

Comparison of Actual and Nominal Levels of Significance in Simulations of "True" Experiments Obtained by Peckham (1968), Hamilton (1972), and McClaren (1972)

Regression Coefficients	Group Sizes					
	$n_1=10, n_2=10$			$n_1=20, n_2=20$		
	Nominal Alpha			Nominal Alpha		
	.10	.05	.01	.10	.05	.01
Peckham						
.5,.5	.094	.052	.013	.102	.049	.013
.4,.6	.096	.050	.010	.089	.045	.009
.3,.7	.091	.045	.011	.097	.051	.009
.2,.8	.076	.039	.006	.076	.038	.008
.1,.9	.055	.029	.004	.055	.027	.005
Hamilton						
.5,.5	.098	.049	.013	.115	.057	.015
.4,.6	.099	.053	.011	.103	.052	.011
.3,.7	.104	.051	.010	.100	.054	.012
.2,.8	.105	.058	.013	.103	.051	.009
.1,.9	.109	.057	.015	.103	.056	.015
McClaren						
.5,.5				.105	.047	.012
.4,.6				.099	.049	.009
.3,.7				.090	.049	.011
.2,.8				.074	.037	.010
.1,.9				.060	.022	.004

PROCEDURE

The effect of violating the following assumptions on F tests associated with ANCOVA, and regions of significance associated with the Johnson-Neyman technique were investigated:

1. heteroscedasticity
2. heterogeneity of variance
3. heterogeneity of variance and heteroscedasticity

The study simulated a simple one-way, fixed-effects analysis with two treatment groups, one criterion, and one covariate. Five fixed values of X, the covariate, assumed to be measured without error, with zero mean and unit variance, were selected. Four combinations of group sizes were used: 10,10;20,20;10,20; and 20,10; with an equal number of cases at each fixed value of X. All assumptions underlying the two methods were met except those under study. The value of the regression coefficient was held constant at $\beta = .75$, and the expected values of $\hat{Y}$ ($\hat{Y} = \beta X + \alpha$) for both groups were -0.8485, -0.4243, 0.0000, +0.4243, +0.8485. Nominal significance levels of .01 to .99, increasing in steps of .01, were used for comparison with empirical α levels.

Heterogeneity of Variance

Three values of heterogeneity of variance were studied; $\sigma^2_{y|x}$ was set at 3 values: 1, 2, and 5. As $\sigma^2_{y|x}$ changes, while β and σ^2_x are held constant, there is a concomitant change in ρ and σ^2_y ; resulting values are shown in Table 2. $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 1$ was paired with $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 1$ (homogeneity of variance), $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 2$, and $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 5$. These pairs combined with each of the pairs of group sizes produced 11 experimental conditions ($\sigma^2_{y|x} = 1$ paired with $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 1$ and group size combinations 10,20 and 20,10 are equivalent).

Table 2

Values of σ^2_y and ρ where

$\sigma^2_{y|x}=\sigma^2_y(1-\rho^2)$ and $\alpha^2_x=1, \beta=.75$

$\sigma^2_{y\|x}$	σ^2_y	ρ
1	1.56	0.60
2	2.56	0.47
5	5.56	0.32

Heteroscedasticity

Five forms of heteroscedasticity were studied. The average value of $\sigma^2_{y|x}$ was held constant at 1, 2, or 5, while values of the error variance for each fixed X ($\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$) were distributed over the 5 fixed values of X so that the following forms were approximated:

a. Equal $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ for all X_{ij}, homoscedasticity (form A).

b. Greatest $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ in the center with gradually decreasing $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ to either end point (form B).

c. Greatest $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ at the largest value of X and gradually decreasing to the smallest value of X (form C).

d. Greatest $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ at the smallest value of X and gradually increasing to the largest value of X (form D).

e. Smallest $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ in the center gradually increasing to either end point (form E).

Table 3 gives $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ at each fixed point of X for the 5 forms where $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 1$, $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 2$, and $\sigma^2_{y|x} = 5$, and a graphic representation of the forms of heteroscedasticity is presented in Figure 1. When combined in pairs, the 5 forms of heteroscedasticity produce 25 combinations (including the null case). The pairings of form D with forms A, B, C, and E are the reverse repetitions of pairs CA, CB, CD, and CE and, hence, these were not investigated. Thus, there were 18 combinations of heteroscedasticity which were combined with 11 combinations of group sizes and variance ratios. Where group sizes and variances were equal, mirror images of combinations were not investigated. Therefore, the total number of simulated experimental conditions was reduced to 186.

Table 3

Values for $\sigma^2_{y|x}{}_{ij}$ where $\sigma^2_{y|x}$=1,2, or 5, for the Five Forms of Heteroscedasticity for the Five Fixed Values of the Concomitant Variable, X

X_{ij} Fixed Value of X	Form of Heteroscedasticity A	B	C	D	E
	$\sigma^2_{y\|x} = 1$				
-1.4142	1.00	0.45	0.35	1.75	1.50
-0.7071	1.00	0.925	0.70	1.20	0.85
0.0000	1.00	2.25	1.00	1.00	0.30
+0.7071	1.00	0.925	1.20	0.70	0.85
+1.4142	1.00	0.45	1.75	0.35	1.50
	$\sigma^2_{y\|x} = 2$				
-1.4142	2.00	0.90	0.70	3.50	3.00
-0.7071	2.00	1.85	1.40	2.40	1.70
0.0000	2.00	4.50	2.00	2.00	0.60
+0.7071	2.00	1.85	2.40	1.40	1.70
+1.4142	2.00	0.90	3.50	0.70	3.00
	$\sigma^2_{y\|x} = 5$				
-1.4142	5.00	2.25	1.75	8.75	7.50
-0.7071	5.00	4.625	3.50	6.00	4.25
0.0000	5.00	11.25	5.00	5.00	1.50
+0.7071	5.00	4.625	6.00	3.50	4.25
+1.4142	5.00	2.25	8.75	1.75	7.50

Fig. 1. Forms of heteroscedasticity studied (form A is homoscedastic). Each vertical line is in standard deviation units, and the average unit is 1.

The Simulation Procedure

For each of the 186 simulated conditions, the following parameters were set:

1. The fixed set of values for X, the concomitant variable.

2. The number of observations per fixed X for each group.

3. The expectation of the dependent variable Y_i for each fixed X_{ij}.

4. The standard deviation, $\sigma_{y|x_{ij}}$, of each fixed X_{ij} for each group.

5. The number of samples, which was set equal to 3000.

UNIVAC 1108 Math-Pak (1970) subroutines RANDN and RANDU were used to generate random numbers. RANDU computes uniformly distributed pseudo-random real numbers between 0 and 1, whereas, RANDN produces sets of pseudo-random numbers which are normally distributed with a specified mean and standard deviation. Studies (UNIVAC 1108 Math-Pak Programmer's Reference Manual, UP-7542, section 14.3) have shown that the initialization number for the random number generator is critical for ensuring properties of randomness. Therefore, RANDU was used to supply a new starting number to RANDN for each of the 3000 samples in each run. A check on randomness of the generated sequences was made for each of the 186 initialization numbers. Using each of the initialization numbers an empirical F distribution was created for the case where no assumptions were violated and group sizes were each equal to 10. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to assess the goodness-of-fit of these empirical F distributions to theoretical F distributions; at $\alpha = .05$, the test failed to reject the hyopthesis of no difference between the nominal and empirical distributions for all initialization numbers used. In addition, checks of the randomness and normality of the samples generated by RANDN have been run and satisfactory results have been reported by Hamilton (1972).

Goodness-of-fit Procedure

A total of 186 different goodness-of-fit testing situations were simulated in this study. Both ANCOVA and the Johnson-Neyman technique were carried out for each experimental condition. Ninety-nine F values were computed for each simulation at significance levels ranging from .01 to .99 in steps of .01. The goodness-of-fit of the empirical F distributions for ANCOVA to the theoretical F distributions was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov one-sample goodness-of-fit test at $\alpha = .05$ (Siegel, 1956). In addition, the number of Type I errors was computed at each of the significance levels.

For the Johnson-Neyman technique, the probability that each fixed X would be included in a region of significance, as well as the total probability of obtaining any region of significance, and probabilities of obtaining central versus tail regions at nominal significance levels of .01, .025, .05, and .10 were computed.

RESULTS

The Analysis of Covariance

The results of the goodness-of-fit tests in each of the 186 simulated conditions are presented in Table 4. The symbol NS means that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test failed to reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the empirical and nominal F distributions; the symbol S means that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test rejected the null hypothesis. The forms of heteroscedasticity are represented by letters A,B,C,D, and E (see Figure 1, or Table 3). The empirical significance levels corresponding to the nominal levels of .10,.05,.02, and .01 for all experimental combinations are shown in Table 5.

The Johnson-Neyman Technique

The empirical probability of the inclusion of each fixed value of X in a region of significance at nominal alpha levels of .10,.05,.025, and .01 under each of the 186 simulated experimental conditions is reported in Table 6. Table 7 shows empirical probabilities of obtaining any region of significance, when the nominal alpha level was set at .10,.05,.025, and .01.

Table 4

Results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness-of-fit Tests of the Empirical to the Theoretical F Distribution for Each of the Simulated Experimental Conditions

Group Size		Variance		Heteroscedasticity Combinations																
G1[a]	G2[a]	G1[a]	G2[a]	AA	BB	CC	DD	EE	AB	BA	AC	CA	AE	EA	BC	CB	BE	EB	CD	CE	EC
10	10	1	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	--	NS	--	NS	--	NS	--	NS	--	NS	NS	--
		2	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
		5	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
10	20	1	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
		2	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
		5	1	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
		1	2	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
		1	5	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
20	20	1	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	--	NS	--	NS	--	NS	--	NS	--	NS	NS	--
		2	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
		5	1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

[a]G refers to group.

Table 5

Empirical Alpha Levels Corresponding to Nominal Alpha Levels of .10, .05, .02, and .01 for Each Simulated Experimental Condition

VARIANCE ERROR OF ESTIMATE GROUP ONE = 1 GROUP TWO = 1

	PAIRS OF GROUP SIZES											
	G1 = 10, G2 = 10				G1 = 10, G2 = 20				G1 = 20, G2 = 10				G1 = 20, G2 = 20			
ALPHA =	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01
AA	.102	.056	.021	.012	.105	.056	.025	.014					.098	.040	.017	.008
BB	.096	.044	.019	.008	.102	.048	.016	.007					.101	.047	.019	.008
CC	.098	.046	.017	.007	.096	.047	.016	.008					.097	.047	.018	.008
DD	.103	.048	.017	.007	.099	.047	.017	.009					.106	.043	.021	.011
EE	.091	.046	.019	.010	.094	.047	.018	.009					.100	.046	.020	.009
AB	.090	.042	.016	.008	.108	.057	.024	.013					.108	.057	.023	.011
BA					.090	.040	.017	.007								
AC	.102	.052	.023	.011	.102	.047	.018	.010					.111	.057	.025	.012
CA					.092	.048	.019	.009								
AE	.102	.050	.020	.009	.092	.047	.018	.008					.102	.047	.018	.009
EA					.101	.051	.019	.011								
BC	.097	.052	.017	.008	.091	.042	.013	.006					.089	.044	.018	.006
CB					.098	.053	.015	.007								
BE	.092	.040	.014	.007	.098	.051	.020	.009					.094	.045	.021	.010
EB					.089	.042	.014	.007								
CD	.102	.051	.020	.010	.095	.051	.021	.010					.108	.055	.021	.010
CE	.102	.053	.019	.010	.103	.053	.022	.013					.102	.048	.018	.009
EC					.100	.047	.020	.008								

Note: Where line is blank the experimental condition was not run due to its similarity to a condition which is reported in the table.

Table 5--Continued

VARIANCE ERROR OF ESTIMATE GROUP ONE = 2 GROUP TWO = 1

PAIRS OF GROUP SIZES

	G1 = 10, G2 = 10				G1 = 10, G2 = 20				G1 = 20, G2 = 10				G1 = 20, G2 = 20			
ALPHA =	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01
AA	.100	.047	.020	.011	.145	.082	.034	.018	.070	.037	.012	.005	.109	.055	.020	.011
BB	.098	.051	.020	.010	.143	.081	.032	.018	.070	.028	.009	.003	.098	.048	.022	.011
CC	.093	.047	.018	.008	.141	.080	.038	.019	.064	.022	.008	.002	.098	.050	.021	.009
DD	.105	.054	.023	.012	.147	.077	.034	.018	.073	.032	.015	.005	.100	.051	.020	.011
EE	.110	.057	.020	.009	.151	.078	.039	.021	.067	.029	.009	.004	.101	.049	.020	.010
AB	.107	.050	.021	.010	.133	.075	.031	.017	.060	.026	.010	.006	.095	.048	.021	.011
BA	.100	.046	.016	.006	.135	.076	.036	.019	.065	.029	.010	.004	.091	.043	.016	.009
AC	.093	.050	.019	.009	.141	.080	.038	.022	.068	.028	.009	.003	.106	.058	.025	.012
CA	.103	.049	.021	.011	.139	.081	.033	.019	.072	.031	.012	.006	.098	.048	.018	.006
AE	.101	.051	.021	.010	.138	.081	.033	.018	.073	.031	.012	.005	.102	.047	.017	.010
EA	.094	.046	.019	.009	.141	.078	.035	.020	.072	.030	.010	.004	.107	.056	.020	.010
BC	.107	.053	.022	.011	.144	.075	.035	.019	.063	.028	.011	.005	.105	.057	.023	.011
CB	.100	.048	.016	.007	.148	.082	.038	.018	.071	.033	.012	.005	.100	.051	.020	.010
BE	.097	.052	.024	.014	.142	.078	.029	.018	.066	.030	.010	.004	.098	.048	.019	.009
EB	.108	.055	.019	.007	.147	.084	.035	.020	.065	.028	.006	.002	.091	.045	.019	.007
CD	.108	.054	.022	.010	.137	.077	.034	.018	.070	.030	.009	.004	.103	.051	.025	.015
CE	.096	.046	.018	.010	.141	.081	.037	.020	.066	.028	.007	.002	.106	.053	.025	.012
EC	.102	.047	.020	.009	.144	.086	.037	.022	.069	.030	.009	.005	.089	.045	.016	.008

Table 5--Continued

VARIANCE ERROR OF ESTIMATE GROUP ONE = 5 GROUP TWO = 1

	PAIRS OF GROUP SIZES															
	G1 = 10, G2 = 10				G1 = 10, G2 = 20				G1 = 20, G2 = 10				G1 = 20, G2 = 20			
ALPHA =	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01	.10	.05	.02	.01
AA	.105	.054	.021	.012	.197	.119	.064	.043	.044	.015	.003	.002	.096	.051	.019	.008
BB	.099	.051	.021	.010	.190	.113	.055	.032	.040	.014	.003	.001	.096	.046	.018	.009
CC	.096	.051	.022	.012	.187	.117	.060	.037	.040	.011	.003	.001	.107	.056	.022	.009
DD	.104	.058	.027	.014	.198	.130	.072	.045	.045	.017	.005	.001	.107	.054	.020	.009
EE	.103	.052	.022	.008	.206	.132	.069	.040	.041	.012	.004	.001	.103	.052	.022	.012
AB	.108	.057	.028	.016	.205	.127	.072	.049	.042	.012	.002	.000	.098	.050	.021	.010
BA	.095	.044	.016	.008	.192	.118	.063	.040	.047	.019	.005	.003	.097	.049	.023	.009
AC	.109	.057	.027	.014	.196	.124	.071	.046	.052	.018	.005	.002	.108	.055	.020	.010
CA	.104	.056	.021	.010	.202	.125	.073	.047	.040	.016	.005	.001	.097	.050	.024	.013
AE	.105	.050	.024	.01[illegible]	.203	.128	.068	.043	.040	.013	.004	.001	.108	.058	.024	.012
EA	.092	.046	.021	.01[illegible]	.187	.108	.061	.038	.043	.016	.004	.002	.094	.045	.018	.008
BC	.113	.059	.025	.013	.179	.114	.056	.032	.050	.018	.004	.001	.110	.050	.024	.011
CB	.109	.054	.026	.012	.205	.136	.068	.045	.041	.016	.004	.001	.099	.048	.019	.010
BE	.101	.050	.018	.008	.205	.126	.065	.043	.041	.016	.006	.003	.105	.052	.024	.010
EB	.115	.054	.025	.013	.190	.116	.063	.042	.041	.014	.004	.002	.103	.056	.025	.014
CD	.107	.055	.022	.013	.192	.112	.063	.041	.050	.021	.006	.003	.104	.055	.019	.008
CE	.099	.053	.024	.014	.201	.132	.066	.042	.040	.016	.005	.003	.109	.058	.024	.012
EC	.109	.060	.026	.013	.205	.126	.068	.039	.045	.017	.004	.002	.119	.058	.023	.013

Note: A,B,C,D,E refer to forms of heteroscedasticity.

Table 6

Empirical Probability of Inclusion of Each Fixed X in a Region of Significance at Nominal Alpha Levels of .10, .05, .025, and .01 for Each Experimental Condition

	ALPHA =		.10					.05					.025					.01				
	FIXED X =		X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5
	G SIZE	VAR																				
AA	10,10	1,1	.096	.096	.100	.110	.109	.048	.048	.056	.054	.059	.019	.020	.027	.032	.033	.007	.008	.010	.013	.012
		2,1	.107	.100	.101	.104	.110	.053	.052	.047	.052	.054	.030	.027	.025	.024	.023	.010	.009	.010	.010	.010
		5,1	.102	.103	.109	.102	.100	.058	.058	.054	.053	.052	.032	.031	.027	.029	.027	.016	.013	.012	.013	.013
	10,20	1,1	.100	.109	.104	.101	.096	.050	.055	.055	.055	.046	.023	.027	.029	.024	.027	.010	.013	.013	.010	.009
		2,1	.155	.150	.149	.144	.146	.084	.082	.081	.074	.077	.048	.048	.042	.040	.042	.020	.020	.018	.020	.020
		5,1	.202	.202	.201	.201	.205	.133	.127	.125	.128	.129	.084	.077	.079	.082	.082	.042	.042	.043	.044	.044
		1,2	.072	.069	.069	.078	.070	.035	.032	.037	.030	.029	.015	.017	.017	.013	.010	.005	.007	.006	.003	.003
		1,5	.041	.043	.042	.044	.040	.015	.015	.016	.018	.018	.007	.005	.006	.008	.008	.001	.001	.002	.002	.002
	20,20	1,1	.100	.096	.098	.101	.100	.052	.054	.045	.047	.054	.028	.027	.021	.023	.025	.009	.011	.009	.009	.009
		2,1	.106	.104	.109	.111	.109	.052	.054	.055	.054	.056	.025	.027	.027	.029	.027	.012	.012	.011	.013	.013
		5,1	.096	.094	.097	.094	.093	.049	.047	.050	.049	.045	.025	.025	.025	.025	.027	.011	.008	.008	.012	.012
BB	10,10	1,1	.045	.066	.091	.071	.047	.018	.031	.039	.027	.018	.008	.013	.021	.014	.009	.003	.006	.008	.007	.002
		2,1	.049	.074	.093	.069	.046	.021	.034	.048	.033	.019	.006	.017	.022	.015	.008	.002	.005	.010	.004	.003
		5,1	.049	.071	.095	.074	.056	.022	.031	.048	.038	.024	.009	.015	.024	.019	.013	.004	.005	.010	.008	.004
	10,20	1,1	.045	.069	.097	.071	.050	.019	.032	.045	.029	.020	.007	.012	.020	.013	.009	.002	.005	.007	.004	.004
		2,1	.077	.106	.142	.112	.082	.037	.059	.080	.058	.039	.014	.027	.043	.029	.020	.006	.010	.016	.010	.005
		5,1	.117	.151	.189	.155	.116	.066	.086	.110	.087	.065	.034	.053	.064	.051	.037	.016	.023	.032	.026	.016
		1,2	.026	.040	.068	.045	.027	.010	.017	.024	.015	.009	.004	.007	.010	.006	.004	.002	.003	.003	.001	.000
		1,5	.014	.025	.038	.026	.013	.003	.007	.012	.007	.004	.001	.001	.004	.002	.001	.000	.000	.001	.001	.000
	20,20	1,1	.045	.071	.095	.069	.044	.019	.029	.047	.032	.016	.007	.014	.022	.013	.007	.001	.004	.008	.005	.003
		2,1	.052	.078	.097	.076	.056	.021	.034	.047	.038	.023	.007	.015	.027	.018	.009	.002	.005	.010	.007	.002
		5,1	.054	.074	.093	.069	.054	.022	.034	.046	.033	.022	.010	.014	.022	.015	.010	.002	.005	.008	.006	.004
CC	10,10	1,1	.038	.038	.103	.170	.179	.016	.011	.050	.102	.104	.006	.005	.026	.061	.063	.001	.001	.008	.026	.030
		2,1	.029	.030	.100	.173	.172	.009	.013	.051	.099	.105	.003	.005	.027	.057	.057	.001	.001	.010	.028	.028
		5,1	.040	.040	.102	.174	.179	.017	.018	.057	.106	.111	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.007	.032	.069	.066
	10,20	1,1	.003	.003	.014	.032	.036	.011	.010	.049	.103	.103	.003	.003	.023	.058	.062	.000	.000	.009	.029	.030
		2,1	.055	.054	.146	.227	.229	.026	.025	.086	.150	.148	.011	.010	.055	.097	.097	.005	.004	.023	.056	.062
		5,1	.104	.098	.193	.270	.272	.050	.049	.124	.192	.192	.023	.024	.077	.136	.138	.006	.011	.044	.086	.089
		1,2	.019	.014	.066	.116	.123	.004	.004	.026	.063	.066	.001	.000	.011	.032	.035	.000	.000	.002	.013	.015
		1,5	.010	.007	.040	.088	.039	.001	.002	.013	.042	.041	.001	.001	.005	.018	.019	.000	.000	.001	.008	.007
	20,20	1,1	.034	.032	.099	.164	.163	.012	.010	.050	.097	.101	.004	.004	.024	.054	.055	.001	.001	.009	.028	.030
		2,1	.035	.035	.098	.172	.177	.013	.012	.052	.098	.104	.005	.006	.026	.061	.064	.002	.003	.009	.032	.032
		5,1	.031	.031	.106	.191	.191	.010	.008	.058	.112	.110	.004	.001	.029	.067	.064	.000	.001	.011	.034	.034

Table 6--Continued

		ALPHA =	.10					.05					.025					.01				
		FIXED X =	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5
	G SIZE	VAR																				
	10,10	1,1	.174	.177	.105	.038	.036	.106	.105	.052	.015	.017	.060	.057	.025	.007	.006	.026	.028	.009	.002	.001
		2,1	.170	.171	.108	.036	.037	.100	.106	.059	.016	.015	.059	.059	.031	.007	.006	.027	.030	.013	.003	.002
		5,1	.170	.168	.107	.043	.043	.104	.106	.061	.016	.016	.066	.068	.035	.008	.005	.036	.035	.018	.004	.002
	10,20	1,1	.169	.164	.100	.033	.033	.099	.100	.052	.010	.013	.058	.058	.026	.004	.004	.031	.031	.011	.001	.000
DD		2,1	.232	.235	.149	.057	.062	.154	.152	.081	.024	.025	.103	.099	.048	.011	.010	.054	.052	.021	.003	.003
		5,1	.292	.283	.206	.094	.100	.210	.199	.137	.048	.049	.146	.147	.090	.024	.023	.091	.094	.051	.012	.010
		1,2	.121	.129	.074	.022	.019	.069	.068	.033	.008	.006	.041	.042	.021	.003	.001	.017	.019	.006	.001	.001
		1,5	.091	.089	.045	.009	.007	.045	.045	.017	.002	.002	.022	.021	.007	.001	.000	.008	.007	.001	.000	.000
	20,20	1,1	.173	.180	.107	.033	.033	.109	.107	.047	.011	.010	.071	.066	.027	.004	.003	.032	.035	.014	.002	.000
		2,1	.189	.177	.104	.039	.039	.108	.104	.053	.019	.015	.064	.064	.029	.006	.005	.033	.031	.013	.002	.001
		5,1	.179	.185	.108	.034	.035	.105	.105	.055	.012	.011	.065	.064	.029	.005	.003	.035	.036	.011	.002	.001
	10,10	1,1	.135	.133	.093	.117	.136	.090	.071	.050	.061	.078	.051	.040	.026	.033	.045	.027	.016	.011	.017	.022
		2,1	.149	.134	.115	.138	.156	.088	.081	.060	.071	.086	.049	.038	.026	.034	.041	.022	.016	.009	.013	.017
		5,1	.151	.132	.107	.130	.152	.090	.071	.055	.078	.087	.052	.039	.028	.042	.050	.025	.019	.011	.019	.023
	10,20	1,1	.138	.117	.094	.118	.133	.075	.058	.049	.057	.077	.041	.033	.024	.031	.041	.020	.015	.009	.013	.018
EE		2,1	.190	.176	.157	.179	.208	.125	.104	.085	.112	.128	.034	.067	.049	.071	.083	.046	.036	.024	.033	.043
		5,1	.258	.235	.217	.247	.265	.176	.156	.139	.154	.178	.119	.100	.086	.100	.121	.069	.057	.046	.063	.076
		1,2	.091	.084	.066	.079	.091	.046	.040	.029	.035	.047	.024	.017	.011	.015	.022	.011	.009	.004	.005	.006
		1,5	.067	.055	.041	.062	.069	.032	.022	.010	.024	.034	.013	.009	.005	.007	.012	.004	.002	.001	.002	.005
	20,20	1,1	.143	.120	.102	.119	.147	.083	.066	.048	.064	.079	.043	.035	.027	.037	.042	.020	.013	.011	.016	.023
		2,1	.145	.121	.104	.125	.135	.076	.060	.052	.067	.082	.042	.033	.025	.034	.050	.021	.016	.011	.015	.026
		5,1	.150	.133	.106	.123	.138	.091	.074	.054	.067	.076	.051	.043	.026	.031	.041	.024	.020	.013	.015	.019
	10,10	1,1	.068	.074	.087	.082	.071	.032	.038	.038	.035	.034	.014	.018	.019	.018	.014	.004	.004	.007	.007	.005
		2,1	.077	.089	.102	.091	.085	.036	.047	.050	.050	.042	.020	.021	.027	.022	.018	.009	.011	.010	.009	.007
		5,1	.103	.106	.107	.111	.105	.055	.054	.056	.059	.056	.028	.030	.035	.033	.029	.011	.013	.016	.015	.014
	10,20	1,1	.093	.104	.107	.094	.087	.048	.050	.057	.048	.037	.025	.027	.031	.023	.022	.009	.014	.013	.010	.010
AB		2,1	.121	.123	.132	.142	.135	.064	.068	.077	.072	.072	.037	.037	.042	.041	.038	.017	.015	.017	.016	.017
		5,1	.189	.206	.208	.208	.203	.117	.130	.130	.128	.124	.072	.077	.083	.082	.077	.039	.046	.051	.046	.043
		1,2	.042	.050	.059	.061	.054	.019	.022	.025	.023	.020	.008	.010	.012	.011	.008	.003	.004	.005	.003	.002
		1,5	.021	.027	.040	.033	.023	.005	.006	.012	.012	.008	.001	.001	.003	.004	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001
	20,20	1,1	.091	.093	.108	.098	.083	.034	.042	.056	.047	.039	.014	.017	.029	.023	.017	.006	.008	.012	.007	.008
		2,1	.079	.088	.096	.097	.091	.036	.040	.048	.045	.041	.020	.020	.027	.025	.020	.007	.008	.010	.010	.008
		5,1	.100	.109	.099	.092	.093	.051	.054	.051	.042	.040	.029	.023	.028	.022	.019	.012	.009	.010	.008	.008

Table 6--Continued

		ALPHA =	.10					.05					.025					.01				
		FIXED X =	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5
	G SIZE	VAR																				
	10,10	2,1	.068	.083	.096	.080	.064	.028	.036	.045	.032	.030	.014	.018	.021	.013	.011	.005	.007	.007	.005	.005
		5,1	.059	.072	.088	.077	.060	.027	.033	.041	.032	.025	.015	.017	.019	.011	.010	.005	.005	.008	.005	.004
	10,20	1,1	.064	.083	.087	.075	.066	.031	.035	.041	.032	.030	.011	.016	.020	.019	.013	.004	.006	.007	.007	.004
BA		2,1	.089	.109	.133	.114	.092	.045	.056	.075	.059	.043	.021	.030	.040	.032	.022	.008	.013	.020	.015	.006
		5,1	.136	.162	.191	.166	.133	.073	.098	.118	.090	.071	.043	.058	.073	.057	.035	.018	.028	.039	.027	.017
		1,2	.044	.054	.061	.050	.042	.017	.024	.026	.019	.017	.008	.009	.012	.007	.006	.003	.003	.004	.003	.002
		1,5	.033	.034	.045	.035	.031	.010	.015	.019	.016	.012	.005	.005	.007	.005	.002	.001	.002	.003	.001	.001
	20,20	2,1	.063	.078	.089	.082	.071	.030	.036	.045	.036	.031	.013	.015	.019	.014	.012	.004	.005	.008	.006	.004
		5,1	.085	.075	.097	.081	.058	.025	.037	.048	.037	.025	.012	.019	.026	.016	.012	.004	.007	.010	.006	.004
	10,10	1,1	.066	.068	.105	.140	.138	.031	.030	.053	.079	.076	.011	.011	.028	.041	.044	.004	.005	.013	.023	.022
		2,1	.070	.078	.100	.116	.120	.033	.034	.051	.067	.063	.016	.013	.024	.036	.035	.005	.005	.010	.015	.016
		5,1	.100	.102	.111	.117	.115	.053	.050	.056	.065	.065	.031	.029	.034	.035	.036	.016	.014	.016	.017	.016
	10,20	1,1	.074	.073	.106	.128	.125	.033	.033	.048	.072	.070	.017	.017	.023	.040	.038	.006	.005	.010	.018	.017
AC		2,1	.130	.124	.143	.167	.169	.075	.072	.082	.098	.100	.042	.040	.049	.056	.058	.020	.019	.022	.029	.024
		5,1	.196	.197	.205	.205	.219	.121	.124	.129	.140	.138	.079	.082	.087	.086	.087	.044	.045	.046	.051	.048
		1,2	.042	.042	.067	.103	.095	.016	.015	.029	.048	.051	.008	.006	.014	.024	.027	.002	.002	.003	.012	.012
		1,5	.016	.021	.051	.082	.080	.004	.007	.018	.039	.038	.001	.002	.006	.015	.017	.000	.000	.002	.008	.007
	20,20	1,1	.069	.066	.113	.146	.143	.026	.030	.057	.084	.079	.011	.012	.030	.047	.043	.005	.006	.012	.023	.022
		2,1	.078	.076	.106	.139	.139	.037	.036	.058	.078	.076	.019	.018	.028	.041	.038	.008	.007	.012	.020	.017
		5,1	.089	.087	.107	.119	.114	.048	.046	.054	.063	.063	.022	.023	.025	.033	.037	.008	.008	.011	.016	.014
	10,10	2,1	.054	.054	.106	.153	.159	.026	.024	.052	.087	.089	.009	.009	.029	.047	.049	.003	.003	.013	.026	.021
		5,1	.054	.050	.104	.161	.162	.025	.024	.057	.093	.096	.010	.013	.031	.056	.057	.005	.004	.012	.025	.028
	10,20	1,1	.054	.052	.090	.142	.144	.017	.019	.048	.076	.077	.009	.008	.024	.042	.043	.003	.002	.011	.019	.021
CA		2,1	.078	.075	.141	.202	.206	.034	.035	.085	.126	.125	.014	.017	.046	.081	.082	.006	.006	.020	.047	.047
		5,1	.105	.116	.205	.279	.286	.058	.058	.132	.192	.194	.028	.031	.091	.137	.138	.013	.013	.053	.094	.092
		1,2	.041	.040	.071	.086	.086	.016	.016	.031	.042	.039	.005	.008	.015	.021	.020	.001	.003	.005	.008	.007
		1,5	.028	.026	.038	.063	.065	.011	.008	.015	.029	.026	.004	.004	.007	.010	.009	.001	.000	.001	.002	.002
	20,20	2,1	.057	.051	.097	.149	.151	.020	.021	.049	.084	.087	.008	.008	.023	.047	.051	.001	.002	.006	.023	.021
		5,1	.043	.048	.096	.151	.151	.015	.020	.048	.088	.095	.006	.006	.028	.052	.048	.002	.002	.013	.025	.021

Table 6--Continued

	G SIZE	VAR	ALPHA = .10					.05					.025					.01				
			FIXED X =	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5
AE	10,10	1,1		.130	.118	.108	.112	.122	.068	.065	.051	.060	.067	.039	.037	.027	.028	.033	.018	.015	.010	.010	.013
		2,1		.117	.114	.104	.109	.111	.064	.065	.050	.054	.062	.035	.027	.027	.033	.040	.016	.012	.011	.014	.018
		5,1		.110	.112	.105	.105	.110	.059	.058	.051	.053	.052	.031	.029	.029	.027	.029	.013	.012	.013	.013	.013
	10,20	1,1		.120	.113	.093	.103	.111	.062	.056	.047	.051	.059	.034	.029	.022	.024	.032	.014	.010	.010	.008	.014
		2,1		.154	.154	.142	.142	.148	.095	.088	.081	.077	.087	.054	.047	.044	.042	.048	.028	.026	.020	.021	.023
		5,1		.207	.205	.208	.220	.224	.129	.128	.135	.137	.139	.084	.078	.084	.087	.095	.047	.045	.046	.047	.054
		1,2		.085	.074	.071	.082	.092	.035	.031	.031	.036	.039	.015	.015	.015	.016	.018	.007	.007	.005	.007	.007
		1,5		.064	.052	.039	.052	.062	.025	.018	.013	.020	.027	.009	.008	.005	.008	.012	.003	.002	.001	.002	.004
	20,20	1,1		.116	.115	.102	.111	.123	.067	.059	.050	.057	.063	.034	.028	.022	.026	.033	.015	.011	.010	.011	.012
		2,1		.116	.109	.102	.118	.116	.057	.052	.046	.061	.064	.033	.025	.021	.027	.030	.012	.010	.009	.009	.012
		5,1		.112	.116	.109	.108	.111	.059	.061	.059	.055	.058	.034	.029	.031	.029	.033	.015	.015	.013	.015	.016
EA	10,10	2,1		.141	.124	.098	.117	.130	.080	.067	.049	.061	.080	.044	.034	.026	.033	.042	.022	.017	.010	.014	.019
		5,1		.142	.125	.095	.123	.141	.080	.068	.050	.064	.079	.051	.036	.027	.038	.042	.024	.015	.013	.018	.022
	10,20	1,1		.131	.120	.103	.112	.132	.072	.062	.051	.056	.070	.041	.033	.024	.027	.032	.018	.014	.010	.011	.014
		2,1		.181	.164	.144	.151	.170	.112	.103	.082	.091	.104	.074	.063	.046	.054	.061	.038	.032	.020	.023	.031
		5,1		.246	.219	.194	.225	.253	.165	.147	.120	.141	.164	.109	.097	.077	.089	.109	.069	.055	.040	.052	.067
		1,2		.079	.076	.071	.075	.085	.044	.035	.031	.036	.039	.022	.017	.013	.018	.018	.008	.005	.004	.005	.007
		1,5		.052	.046	.040	.046	.052	.017	.015	.015	.017	.021	.007	.006	.005	.007	.007	.002	.001	.001	.001	.002
	20,20	2,1		.123	.113	.108	.115	.119	.063	.058	.055	.060	.069	.033	.029	.027	.031	.040	.015	.015	.009	.014	.016
		5,1		.139	.120	.096	.119	.135	.075	.062	.046	.060	.076	.045	.035	.024	.031	.040	.022	.016	.008	.013	.016
BC	10,10	1,1		.039	.053	.097	.115	.107	.016	.021	.051	.063	.057	.006	.009	.022	.032	.031	.002	.004	.009	.014	.011
		2,1		.047	.065	.101	.107	.093	.022	.027	.051	.056	.048	.008	.012	.026	.029	.024	.003	.005	.011	.015	.010
		5,1		.058	.076	.110	.099	.078	.022	.031	.057	.051	.040	.008	.015	.027	.029	.018	.002	.005	.013	.011	.008
	10,20	1,1		.041	.049	.088	.103	.091	.016	.020	.041	.049	.044	.006	.009	.019	.022	.018	.001	.002	.006	.007	.005
		2,1		.075	.097	.141	.133	.107	.034	.050	.077	.075	.061	.015	.026	.042	.043	.034	.006	.009	.019	.023	.017
		5,1		.121	.148	.180	.174	.142	.063	.079	.111	.098	.079	.029	.044	.065	.057	.043	.014	.021	.032	.027	.020
		1,2		.023	.032	.064	.087	.075	.005	.008	.027	.042	.035	.002	.004	.013	.019	.017	.000	.001	.005	.007	.006
		1,5		.010	.014	.053	.071	.062	.001	.003	.018	.031	.028	.000	.001	.005	.016	.013	.000	.000	.001	.005	.004
	20,20	1,1		.040	.045	.088	.119	.110	.014	.018	.045	.059	.055	.006	.007	.021	.032	.028	.001	.003	.007	.011	.010
		2,1		.051	.071	.105	.113	.101	.021	.028	.054	.064	.054	.007	.011	.028	.035	.026	.001	.003	.011	.012	.011
		5,1		.047	.065	.108	.094	.076	.019	.029	.050	.051	.038	.009	.012	.027	.027	.018	.002	.005	.011	.012	.008

Table 6--Continued

		ALPHA =	.10					.05					.025					.01				
		FIXED X =	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5
	G SIZE	VAR																				
	10,10	2,1	.039	.044	.099	.127	.117	.014	.018	.050	.068	.062	.005	.006	.023	.039	.034	.001	.001	.006	.013	.013
		5,1	.040	.043	.110	.166	.165	.016	.019	.058	.102	.097	.008	.008	.035	.058	.056	.002	.004	.014	.030	.029
	10,20	1,1	.041	.050	.097	.131	.124	.016	.016	.051	.068	.062	.007	.006	.023	.036	.035	.002	.002	.008	.015	.014
CB		2,1	.062	.070	.152	.201	.197	.027	.029	.086	.130	.124	.009	.014	.050	.083	.079	.005	.005	.021	.046	.044
		5,1	.103	.104	.212	.277	.275	.053	.052	.141	.206	.195	.030	.028	.088	.144	.143	.014	.013	.053	.094	.091
		1,2	.021	.025	.008	.090	.080	.006	.009	.033	.043	.036	.001	.002	.016	.022	.018	.000	.000	.005	.010	.007
		1,5	.013	.016	.040	.045	.036	.004	.005	.015	.017	.012	.001	.003	.005	.008	.004	.000	.001	.001	.002	.001
	20,20	2,1	.042	.049	.099	.145	.132	.013	.019	.051	.077	.073	.006	.009	.026	.040	.038	.002	.003	.010	.017	.017
		5,1	.056	.060	.103	.154	.160	.013	.017	.049	.084	.084	.005	.006	.025	.049	.047	.001	.002	.010	.025	.026
	10,10	1,1	.093	.089	.090	.090	.093	.040	.039	.038	.049	.051	.019	.019	.016	.022	.024	.007	.006	.007	.010	.009
		2,1	.089	.094	.095	.094	.088	.049	.049	.052	.047	.044	.024	.028	.029	.023	.019	.010	.010	.014	.009	.009
		5,1	.070	.085	.100	.089	.073	.036	.042	.048	.038	.030	.016	.022	.021	.017	.013	.006	.008	.007	.007	.005
	10,20	1,1	.086	.098	.095	.092	.082	.046	.046	.050	.040	.038	.019	.024	.023	.019	.017	.009	.009	.009	.007	.004
BE		2,1	.105	.126	.142	.116	.098	.051	.064	.076	.062	.052	.026	.031	.036	.032	.026	.011	.011	.016	.012	.011
		5,1	.131	.168	.205	.197	.153	.073	.097	.128	.115	.088	.044	.061	.078	.070	.052	.021	.029	.042	.038	.027
		1,2	.061	.068	.064	.066	.061	.027	.028	.029	.028	.025	.008	.010	.014	.013	.011	.003	.003	.004	.005	.004
		1,5	.052	.056	.041	.046	.054	.024	.021	.017	.018	.023	.011	.009	.006	.009	.010	.003	.003	.002	.003	.004
	20,20	1,1	.102	.093	.095	.098	.085	.050	.050	.044	.046	.046	.024	.025	.023	.026	.024	.011	.010	.010	.011	.010
		2,1	.086	.079	.097	.090	.079	.026	.036	.046	.044	.036	.013	.017	.025	.022	.016	.006	.006	.009	.007	.006
		5,1	.071	.083	.105	.097	.080	.033	.043	.053	.046	.041	.014	.020	.029	.022	.016	.003	.008	.010	.010	.006
	10,10	2,1	.115	.115	.107	.105	.108	.056	.057	.056	.053	.058	.030	.026	.026	.028	.033	.012	.009	.008	.012	.013
		5,1	.143	.129	.118	.126	.141	.081	.071	.059	.066	.075	.043	.037	.031	.038	.043	.021	.019	.016	.018	.022
	10,20	1,1	.121	.109	.092	.104	.107	.061	.059	.042	.053	.059	.030	.028	.021	.028	.034	.012	.010	.006	.010	.012
EB		2,1	.191	.175	.153	.164	.174	.116	.103	.085	.099	.106	.071	.062	.048	.054	.067	.034	.029	.022	.029	.038
		5,1	.258	.234	.199	.214	.236	.175	.152	.125	.145	.159	.120	.100	.077	.091	.104	.070	.060	.047	.055	.060
		1,2	.070	.062	.065	.060	.060	.029	.025	.029	.027	.026	.011	.010	.009	.013	.013	.004	.004	.002	.005	.005
		1,5	.031	.036	.038	.035	.035	.010	.014	.013	.013	.012	.003	.004	.005	.007	.005	.001	.001	.002	.001	.001
	20,20	2,1	.109	.103	.092	.108	.121	.061	.052	.046	.055	.069	.033	.027	.022	.032	.036	.015	.012	.008	.013	.016
		5,1	.125	.113	.105	.132	.140	.070	.063	.059	.071	.082	.041	.035	.030	.040	.049	.020	.017	.014	.018	.025

Table 6--Continued

		ALPHA =	.10					.05					.025					.01				
		FIXED X =	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5
	G SIZE	VAR																				
CD	10,10	1,1	.103	.099	.104	.105	.114	.054	.052	.053	.057	.057	.025	.028	.027	.030	.031	.012	.014	.011	.013	.014
		2,1	.079	.088	.107	.126	.120	.041	.039	.057	.067	.063	.020	.019	.025	.036	.033	.007	.007	.009	.014	.015
		5,1	.056	.059	.108	.153	.158	.025	.025	.060	.092	.096	.011	.011	.031	.057	.060	.004	.005	.015	.028	.027
	10,20	1,1	.090	.079	.096	.126	.125	.037	.038	.050	.067	.070	.020	.020	.027	.038	.037	.009	.009	.011	.013	.014
		2,1	.090	.095	.138	.189	.193	.042	.043	.079	.119	.118	.020	.021	.042	.072	.070	.009	.007	.020	.034	.037
		5,1	.116	.117	.202	.267	.270	.064	.059	.119	.182	.186	.033	.032	.074	.130	.127	.014	.014	.045	.079	.079
		1,2	.070	.071	.070	.067	.074	.032	.030	.029	.028	.029	.016	.017	.011	.013	.015	.005	.006	.004	.004	.004
		1,5	.060	.065	.047	.027	.028	.027	.028	.021	.011	.012	.014	.013	.008	.005	.005	.005	.004	.003	.002	.001
	20,20	1,1	.108	.108	.108	.105	.102	.052	.057	.057	.051	.055	.025	.026	.028	.028	.029	.009	.010	.009	.011	.011
		2,1	.081	.085	.102	.119	.124	.043	.041	.051	.073	.074	.021	.022	.029	.042	.044	.009	.009	.016	.018	.017
		5,1	.051	.052	.106	.156	.162	.020	.021	.054	.094	.094	.009	.010	.027	.057	.059	.003	.003	.012	.027	.027
CE	10,10	1,1	.091	.081	.107	.153	.159	.040	.035	.053	.084	.093	.020	.015	.028	.045	.052	.008	.004	.010	.020	.024
		2,1	.074	.083	.098	.159	.161	.032	.027	.049	.087	.100	.017	.013	.022	.048	.053	.007	.005	.011	.022	.024
		5,1	.061	.056	.101	.161	.175	.026	.025	.053	.092	.097	.010	.012	.030	.055	.058	.004	.004	.015	.029	.032
	10,20	1,1	.076	.064	.104	.157	.167	.034	.026	.053	.090	.094	.015	.011	.027	.050	.056	.005	.004	.013	.024	.029
		2,1	.090	.083	.145	.205	.208	.044	.039	.081	.128	.128	.021	.017	.050	.081	.083	.007	.007	.023	.044	.049
		5,1	.107	.110	.207	.291	.288	.055	.058	.139	.206	.202	.030	.030	.083	.142	.142	.013	.013	.048	.090	.088
		1,2	.060	.044	.067	.107	.119	.025	.017	.027	.053	.063	.010	.005	.009	.026	.028	.003	.003	.003	.008	.014
		1,5	.049	.039	.043	.066	.077	.020	.013	.015	.026	.036	.007	.005	.007	.010	.014	.002	.002	.002	.003	.005
	20,20	1,1	.093	.084	.102	.140	.159	.044	.035	.049	.075	.086	.018	.015	.023	.044	.047	.007	.006	.009	.020	.022
		2,1	.087	.086	.108	.164	.166	.029	.022	.055	.098	.100	.014	.010	.028	.062	.064	.005	.004	.013	.034	.033
		5,1	.058	.053	.112	.168	.171	.023	.020	.061	.105	.102	.012	.010	.029	.065	.064	.002	.005	.012	.033	.034
EC	10,10	2,1	.103	.093	.106	.140	.154	.055	.047	.051	.081	.090	.027	.023	.023	.044	.053	.010	.007	.010	.019	.019
		5,1	.143	.132	.112	.146	.166	.082	.066	.064	.081	.106	.046	.034	.034	.046	.062	.023	.015	.013	.021	.031
	10,20	1,1	.105	.092	.102	.132	.148	.052	.038	.052	.075	.083	.028	.019	.026	.041	.046	.012	.009	.009	.021	.020
		2,1	.135	.169	.148	.173	.192	.108	.093	.087	.104	.116	.067	.053	.047	.064	.078	.035	.028	.022	.030	.041
		5,1	.257	.230	.215	.243	.268	.170	.153	.136	.161	.180	.119	.098	.086	.110	.122	.070	.056	.044	.062	.077
		1,2	.059	.048	.067	.108	.117	.025	.021	.031	.052	.059	.011	.007	.014	.028	.033	.003	.002	.005	.012	.012
		1,5	.018	.021	.046	.079	.077	.007	.007	.017	.040	.039	.002	.002	.006	.016	.019	.001	.000	.002	.006	.007
	20,20	2,1	.097	.079	.091	.139	.153	.049	.041	.047	.083	.095	.027	.018	.023	.046	.055	.010	.005	.009	.018	.026
		5,1	.131	.120	.120	.143	.157	.079	.062	.061	.084	.091	.040	.031	.032	.047	.053	.019	.015	.012	.022	.028

Note: A, B, C, D, E refer to forms of heteroscedasticity.

Table 7

Empirical Probability of Obtaining A Johnson-Neyman Region of Significance at Nominal Alpha Equal to .10, .05, .025, and .01 for Each Simulated Experimental Condition

GROUP SIZE 1 2	VAR 1 2	ALPHA = .10	.05	.025	.01	.10	.05	.025	.01	.10	.05	.025	.01
		AA				BB				CC			
10,10	1,1	.246	.145	.080	.035	.156	.071	.033	.014	.248	.145	.091	.040
	2,1	.259	.142	.080	.035	.158	.082	.039	.017	.246	.146	.080	.039
	5,1	.251	.149	.084	.038	.163	.083	.046	.016	.254	.152	.095	.049
10,20	1,1	.254	.142	.078	.037	.169	.082	.037	.014	.247	.147	.082	.040
	2,1	.347	.217	.132	.063	.243	.141	.077	.029	.331	.216	.144	.080
	5,1	.436	.304	.213	.125	.313	.194	.124	.063	.408	.288	.202	.127
	1,2	.188	.097	.045	.017	.111	.044	.019	.007	.176	.095	.046	.020
	1,5	.120	.050	.025	.007	.064	.023	.006	.002	.127	.059	.025	.011
20,20	1,1	.256	.150	.078	.032	.163	.075	.040	.012	.247	.149	.084	.040
	2,1	.275	.151	.082	.039	.176	.086	.046	.016	.252	.151	.091	.047
	5,1	.245	.140	.076	.035	.176	.085	.043	.016	.266	.159	.092	.048
		DD				EE				CD			
10,10	1,1	.251	.151	.088	.039	.310	.189	.117	.064	.262	.149	.077	.037
	2,1	.253	.149	.087	.041	.332	.209	.121	.052	.253	.147	.078	.034
	5,1	.244	.147	.093	.051	.323	.211	.126	.052	.255	.155	.094	.049
10,20	1,1	.249	.143	.084	.041	.303	.181	.109	.054	.253	.146	.086	.040
	2,1	.337	.217	.151	.079	.409	.286	.193	.108	.335	.204	.123	.066
	5,1	.419	.299	.214	.131	.512	.383	.279	.178	.422	.292	.205	.124
	1,2	.188	.098	.059	.026	.232	.125	.061	.026	.189	.091	.048	.018
	1,5	.128	.059	.029	.010	.172	.081	.039	.013	.129	.061	.028	.011
20,20	1,1	.255	.147	.093	.048	.319	.191	.115	.063	.266	.152	.082	.037
	2,1	.256	.158	.098	.047	.316	.194	.114	.063	.249	.154	.092	.046
	5,1	.265	.155	.090	.048	.320	.198	.123	.061	.262	.150	.091	.043

Table 7--Continued

GROUP SIZE 1	2	VAR 1	2	ALPHA = .10	.05	.025	.01	.10	.05	.025	.01	.10	.05	.025	.01
				AB				AC				AE			
10	10	1	1	.194	.098	.051	.019	.249	.144	.081	.040	.286	.173	.098	.043
		2	1	.216	.116	.063	.030	.241	.135	.074	.032	.268	.156	.094	.045
		3	1	.254	.147	.088	.043	.258	.148	.091	.049	.262	.147	.086	.040
10	20	1	1	.236	.133	.075	.035	.257	.141	.084	.035	.274	.153	.087	.043
		2	1	.312	.189	.115	.052	.342	.220	.140	.069	.345	.222	.142	.075
		3	1	.432	.294	.201	.124	.439	.301	.213	.135	.450	.324	.224	.139
		1	2	.140	.065	.033	.013	.185	.092	.047	.019	.219	.109	.053	.022
		1	5	.085	.029	.009	.001	.135	.063	.026	.011	.159	.073	.030	.011
20	20	1	1	.226	.122	.062	.026	.255	.148	.085	.042	.289	.167	.095	.044
		2	1	.223	.116	.067	.029	.262	.154	.090	.039	.285	.163	.091	.038
		3	1	.247	.129	.078	.033	.266	.158	.087	.038	.274	.160	.093	.045
				BA				CA				EA			
10	10	2	1	.192	.098	.045	.017	.263	.150	.081	.038	.297	.183	.106	.059
		3	1	.178	.087	.043	.016	.250	.149	.091	.045	.307	.186	.114	.060
10	20	1	1	.195	.094	.049	.020	.249	.133	.073	.037	.293	.181	.106	.049
		2	1	.253	.140	.080	.038	.332	.210	.127	.070	.375	.261	.173	.092
		3	1	.345	.218	.134	.073	.426	.301	.210	.139	.404	.353	.259	.161
		1	2	.134	.063	.028	.010	.175	.085	.041	.017	.210	.114	.059	.023
		1	5	.102	.043	.016	.006	.126	.056	.022	.007	.136	.060	.026	.009
20	20	2	1	.192	.105	.049	.017	.252	.145	.082	.038	.297	.178	.097	.047
		3	1	.179	.096	.050	.021	.246	.142	.080	.039	.313	.187	.108	.054

Table 7--Continued

GROUP SIZE 1	2	VAR 1	2	ALPHA = .10	.05	.025	.01	.10	.05	.025	.01	.10	.05	.025	.01
				BC				BE				CE			
10	10	1	1	.196	.111	.058	.022	.227	.125	.066	.025	.290	.170	.099	.047
		2	1	.205	.108	.054	.023	.221	.126	.067	.031	.272	.157	.089	.042
		5	1	.203	.102	.052	.025	.201	.105	.052	.020	.269	.155	.091	.049
10	20	1	1	.197	.097	.046	.014	.229	.125	.064	.025	.278	.164	.095	.051
		2	1	.262	.147	.084	.042	.276	.160	.093	.039	.343	.219	.137	.077
		5	1	.326	.213	.127	.062	.356	.233	.154	.085	.421	.301	.213	.134
		1	2	.147	.067	.031	.013	.166	.083	.038	.015	.216	.115	.058	.023
		1	5	.110	.047	.021	.006	.147	.070	.034	.013	.155	.073	.031	.011
20	20	1	1	.205	.110	.054	.023	.233	.136	.075	.034	.294	.171	.094	.044
		2	1	.207	.119	.062	.025	.218	.106	.058	.022	.280	.163	.102	.053
		5	1	.194	.100	.054	.023	.219	.117	.062	.022	.272	.163	.101	.051
				CB				EB				EC			
10	10	2	1	.213	.114	.061	.022	.271	.159	.086	.036	.292	.175	.103	.046
		5	1	.242	.144	.085	.046	.321	.187	.111	.058	.328	.207	.126	.071
10	20	1	1	.220	.118	.062	.027	.270	.156	.089	.037	.294	.172	.101	.048
		2	1	.321	.197	.125	.067	.394	.264	.170	.094	.401	.271	.175	.099
		5	1	.413	.295	.208	.138	.483	.356	.255	.165	.505	.376	.278	.181
		1	2	.147	.074	.035	.015	.172	.082	.039	.014	.212	.112	.060	.026
		1	5	.085	.032	.013	.004	.100	.041	.015	.004	.129	.066	.031	.012
20	20	2	1	.226	.127	.069	.032	.270	.159	.090	.045	.276	.178	.102	.055
		5	1	.247	.133	.074	.037	.302	.185	.118	.063	.320	.212	.131	.067

Note: A, B, C, D, E refer to forms of heteroscedasticity.

DISCUSSION

ANCOVA appears to be robust to the violation of the assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance both singly and in combination, when group sizes are equal. In every condition where group sizes and variances were heterogeneous the goodness-of-fit hypothesis was rejected. When the larger variance was combined with the larger group size, the empirical significance levels of ANCOVA were conservative, and when the larger variance was combined with the smaller group size, the empirical alpha levels were nonconservative. The effect of the violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance on the empirical F distribution of ANCOVA parallels the results obtained by Norton (as reported in Lindquist, 1953) and Box (1954) when investigating the effect of heterogeneity of variance on the empirical F distribution of ANOVA. In addition, the results obtained by Hamilton (1972), McClaren (1972), and Peckham (1968), where they investigated the simultaneous violation of the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and regression, are replicated.

The failure to find any condition where heteroscedasticity alone was responsible for the rejection of the goodness-of-fit hypothesis leads one to the conclusion that the assumption of homoscedasticity is not important to ANCOVA. Thus, if variances are homogeneous, the transformation of heteroscedastic data before using ANCOVA, as was suggested by Elashoff (1969), may be unnecessary.

The Johnson-Neyman technique is robust to the violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance when group sizes are equal. However, when group sizes are unequal heterogeneity of variance biases the probabilities of obtaining regions of significance in the same direction as found with ANCOVA. That is, the larger variance combined with the smaller group size produces a non-conservative bias and the larger variance combined with the larger group size produces a conservative bias.

The probability that a fixed X would be included in a region of significance was consistently determined by the form of heteroscedasticity. If the shapes of the probability distributions shown in Table 6 are compared to the shapes of heteroscedasticity in Figure 1, the following conclusions emerge:

1. When $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ is constant across X_{ij}, the probability that X_{ij} is included in a region of significance is constant and equal to the nominal alpha level.

2. When $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ is greatest for the central value of X_{ij} and smallest for the tails, the probability that X_{ij} is included in a region of significance is greatest for the central X_{ij} and smallest for the tails, and in general, the probabilities are conservative.

3. When the $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ is greatest at either end value and progressively decreases to the opposite end value, the probability that X_{ij} will be included in a region of significance follows the size of $\sigma^2_{y|x}$. The average significance level is close to the nominal level of significance.

4. When $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ is smallest for the center X_{ij} and largest at either end, the probability that X_{ij} will be included in a region of significance is greatest at the end values of X and smallest for the central X_{ij}. In general, the empirical probabilities are nonconservative.

The effect of the form of heteroscedasticity when combined with a different form of heteroscedasticity is partially determined by the average variance of the group. The form of heteroscedasticity combined with the larger variance has a greater influence on the form of the probability distribution for fixed values of X.

Although the magnitude of the empirical values of the probabilities are further influenced by the condition of unequal group sizes and heterogeneity of variance, the effects of the form of heteroscedasticity outlined above hold constant. That is, the relative differences in the probabilities associated with each X_{ij} is fixed by the form of heteroscedasticity, but the size of the probabilities are biased by the combination of unequal group sizes and heterogeneity of variance.

The probability of finding any region of significance greatly exceeded the nominal significance level for all forms of heteroscedasticity. As explicated by Potthoff (1964) the Johnson-Neyman technique may be used to specify the region of significance, but does not set simultaneous confidence bounds. For example, one can say with 95 percent confidence that for any specific point P within the region of significance that there is a true difference between the two groups when nominal alpha equals .05. One cannot say with 95 percent confidence that for all points within the region of significance there is a true difference in performance for the two groups.

Although not directly related to the research questions of the dissertation, it is of interest to inquire how to set a simultaneous confidence bound equal to the nominal alpha level. Potthoff suggests a method for setting simultaneous confidence bounds which is basically identical with the defining inequality for the Johnson-Neyman region of significance with the exception that $F_{1,n_1+n_2-4;\alpha}$ is replaced by $(r+1)F_{r+1,n_1+n_2-4;\alpha}$, where r is the number of concomitant variables. When this procedure was tested for the simulated experimental condition of equal group sizes (10,10) and equal variances ($\sigma^2_{y|x}=1, \sigma^2_{y|x}=1$) the probability of finding a region of significance matched the nominal α level as shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Empirical Results Obtained Using Potthoff's Simultaneous Confidence Bounds When All Assumptions Are Met and Group Size Equals 10

	Nominal Alpha			
	.10	.05	.025	.01
Simultaneous Confidence Coefficient	.099	.047	.025	.011

Therefore, it is recommended that Potthoff's procedure for obtaining simultaneous confidence bounds for the Johnson-Neyman technique be utilized when one wishes to obtain a region where one can state with $1-\alpha$ confidence that there is a treatment effect simultaneously for all points within the region.

A second approach to maintaining the experiment-wise Type I error rate at the nominal significance level is to follow the procedure suggested by Johnson and Jackson (1959) and Abelson (1953). First, test for homogeneity of regression; if this hypothesis is rejected proceed with the Johnson-Neyman technique, otherwise, use ANCOVA.

The marked effect of heteroscedasticity on the Johnson-Neyman technique suggests that when heteroscedasticity is observed in the data that the use of the Johnson-Neyman technique is not appropriate if the heteroscedasticity cannot be eliminated or minimized. If forms C and D are present in the data it may be possible to apply a variance-stabilizing transformation (Dayton, 1970). The problem of estimating and testing regression coefficients when $\sigma^2_{y|x_{ij}}$ is a function of X_{ij} has been discussed by Rutemiller and Bowers (1968) and Levenbach (1973). However, the proper way of dealing with heteroscedasticity was a problem presented in the original Johnson and Neyman article (1936) and it has not been solved to date.

SUMMARY

The robustness of the Johnson-Neyman technique and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance was tested through use of Monte Carlo computer procedures. The study simulated a one-way, fixed-effects analysis with two treatment groups, one criterion, Y, and one covariate, X. Five fixed values of the covariate were selected with zero mean and unit variance, while the values of Y were varied randomly with a constant regression coefficient of .75. Four combinations of group sizes (10,10; 10,20;20,10;20,20), five combinations of group variances (1,1;1,2;2,1;1, 5;5,1), and five forms of heteroscedasticity (combined in 18 different

pairs), were studied. These conditions were combined to produce 186 different simulated experimental conditions. For each simulated condition, 3000 pseudo-random samples were generated and sampling distributions relevant to the Johnson-Neyman technique and ANCOVA were compiled.

Results indicated that ANCOVA is robust to violations of assumptions of homoscedasticity and homogeneity of variance, both singly and in combination, when group sizes were equal. For cases of different group sizes and heterogeneous variances a predictable bias was observed. When the larger variance was combined with the larger group size the bias was conservative. When the pairings were reversed the bias was non-conservative. The Johnson-Neyman technique was sensitive to violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity for both equal and unequal group sizes. The effect of heteroscedasticity was to order the probability that any fixed value of X would be included in a region of significance in a sequence parallel to the form of heteroscedasticity. That is, in general, as the variance for a fixed value of X increased, the probability of including that value of the covariate in a region of significance increased. As observed with ANCOVA, the Johnson-Neyman technique was robust to heterogeneity of variance when group sizes were equal. However, when group sizes were not equal the empirical probabilities were biased in a non-conservative direction when the larger variance was combined with the smaller group size, and in a conservative direction when the larger variance and larger group size were combined.

REFERENCES

Abelson, R. P. A note on the Neyman-Johnson technique. Psychometrika, 1953, 18, 213-218.

Atiqullah, M. The robustness of the covariance analysis of a one-way classification. Biometrika, 1964, 51, 365-372.

Bartlett, C. J., and O'Leary, B. A differential prediction model to moderate the effects of heterogeneous groups in personnel selection and classification. Personnel Psychology, 1969, 22, 1-17.

Box, G. E. P. Some theorems on quadratic forms applied in the study of analysis of variance problems: I. Effect of inequality of variance in the one-way classification. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 1954, 25, 290-302.

Bracht, G. H. Experimental factors related to aptitude-treatment interactions. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 627-645.

Cochran, W. G. Analysis of covariance: Its nature and uses. Biometrics, 1957, 13, 261-281

Dayton, C. M. The design of educational experiments. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Ghiselli, E. E. Moderating effects and differential reliability and validity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 81-86.

Glass, G. V., Peckham, P. D., and Sanders, J. R. Consequences of failure to meet assumptions underlying the fixed effects analysis of variance and covariance. Review of Educational Research, 1972, 42(3), 237-288.

Elashoff, J. D. Analysis of covariance: A delicate instrument. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 383-401.

Hamilton, B. L. A Monte Carlo comparison of parametric and nonparametric uses of a concomitant variable. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 1972.

Johnson, P. O., and Jackson, R. W. B. Modern statistical methods descriptive and inductive. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1959.

Johnson, P. O., and Neyman, J. Tests of certain linear hypotheses and their application to some educational problems. In J. Neyman and E. S. Pearson (Eds.), Statistical Research Memoirs, 1936, 1, 57-93.

Levenbach, H. The estimation of heteroscedasticity from a marginal likelihood function. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1973, 68(342), 436-439.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953.

McClaren, V. R. An investigation of the effect of violating the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes in the analysis of covariance model upon the F-statistic. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North State Texas University, Denton, Texas, 1972.

Peckham, P. D. An investigation of the effects of non-homogeneity of regression slopes upon the F-test of analysis of covariance. Laboratory of Educational Research, Report No. 16, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, 1968.

Potthoff, R. F. On the Johnson-Neyman technique and some extensions thereof. Psychometrika, 1964, 29, 241-256.

Potthoff, R. F. Some Scheffé-type tests for some Behrens-Fisher type regression problems. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1965, 60, 1163-1190.

Rutemiller, H. C., and Bowers, D. A. Estimation in a heteroscedastic regression model. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1968, 63, 552-557.

Scheffé, H. The analysis of variance. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

University of Maryland UNIVAC 1108 Exec 8 Math-Pak Users Guide. College Park, Md.: Computer Science Center, University of Maryland, 1970.

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.